REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1 and 9 are amended. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 9-16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims;

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's early indication of allowable subject matter. As indicated below,

objected-to claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim; and

independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite a novel combination of elements not suggested by the reference cited by the Examiner.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

Drawings

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has accepted the drawings.

Claim for Priority

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has recognized the Applicant's claim for foreign priority.

Acknowledgement of Information Disclosure Statement

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 28, 2005.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amendments to Independent Claim 1

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a solenoid, including *inter alia*

wherein a bearing is fitted in both end sections of the first yoke part and the second yoke part including the facing surfaces, is disposed on an outer circumference of the slider, and guides the slider in a movable state, the bearing being made of a nonmagnetic body.

See FIGS. 1, 2, and 3, for example, for support of the novel features above.

Since the first and second yoke parts face the bearing, assembling accuracy can be improved and a greater force can be gained.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745).

In contrast to the invention set forth in claim 1, Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745) fails to disclose a "bearing", so this reference is completely different from the device of present

invention. As can be seen in Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745) FIGS. 1 and 3, the yokes face the outer parts of the coil 2, 21 as a reference position, so assembling accuracy is lower. Further, Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745) fails to disclose a "bearing is disposed on an outer circumference of the slider" as presently claimed. Therefore, even if a "bearing" were to be included in the Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745) device, the present invention cannot be realized.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Mitsubishi (JP-49-91745), at least for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Therefore independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 9

As mentioned above, objected-to claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Therefore, independent claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Further, the dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel limitations set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully requested.

Docket No.0038-0454PUS1 Art Unit:2832 Page 11 of 11

Application No. 10/533,199 Amendment dated March 23, 2006 Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2005

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

James M. Slattery Reg. No. 28.380

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/jmb